

# CHRISTIANITY and CRISIS

*A Christian Journal of Opinion*

DETROIT PUBLIC LIBRARY

JAN 4 1961

PHILOSOPHY, RELIGION  
& EDUCATION

## The Proposal for Church Unity

It is easy to write an editorial on church unity that has the effect of supporting the *status quo* by criticizing all specific proposals for unity. Such is not the intention of this editorial. Our most important concern is that there be some preliminary separation in our minds between the issues that are involved in complete mutual acceptance or recognition between denominations, which is a form of organic unity, and the issues that are involved in a unified church government.

Dr. Eugene Carson Blake's proposal concerning the union of four major Protestant denominations—Presbyterian, Methodist, United Church of Christ and Protestant Episcopal—is to be welcomed if it helps to break down the barriers to full mutual acceptance by those who represent Episcopal and non-Episcopal interpretations of the Church. Such mutual acceptance already exists in principle between the three other denominations. The significant thing about this proposal is that it includes the Protestant Episcopal Church, that it is wholly endorsed by Bishop James Pike, and that Presiding Bishop Arthur Lichtenberger has given the proposal general approval.

When we speak of mutual acceptance, we have in mind full religious, even sacramental, unity between the churches, with full acceptance of each other's ministries, with intercommunion, with unrestricted exchange of members. The terrible offense that is occasioned by separation of Christians at the Lord's Table and by other forms of religious exclusion would be overcome. Also, the way would be prepared for a great variety of forms of organic

unity; for example, in the approach of these denominations to a new community.

There has been criticism that these four denominations happen to be predominantly white, Anglo-Saxon and middle class, and this needs to be considered. Perhaps a union limited to these denominations would create too great a concentration of Christians who have a common racial and social background.

There has also been criticism of the timing of this proposal, that it may actually injure the prospects for the consummation of one actual union of two major denominations, the Congregational Christian Churches and the Evangelical and Reformed Church, into the United Church of Christ. There is evidence that the prospect of this much larger union, which would include the more centralized and hierarchical churches, may intimidate some Congregationalists from joining this united church. We can only hope that this nearly realized union will not be sacrificed to a distant hope that is also a kind of bogey to some churchmen.

The main ground for caution in connection with Dr. Blake's bold proposal, however, is that it appears to look forward to the forming of one vast church including about twenty million members with a common government of some kind. Much careful thinking must be done about the difference between an organic union and a governmental union. A real organic union would include all forms of mutual acceptance and involves symbols and embodiments of religious unity that are not present in existing federations, but it would not

Vol. XX, No. 22, December 26, 1960 \$5.00 per year; 25 cents a copy

attempt to create a single ecclesiastical administration. A governmental union would try to unite the administrations and the bureaucracies of these denominations in one grand scheme.

Bureaucracy is a bad word, and its use often hides the fact that bureaucracies are necessary and often beneficent, but the thought of uniting the superstructures of these four denominations into one great superstructure is appalling. Doubtless there are many things that can be done to overcome destructive competition and duplication, that can encourage the union of many local churches so that a village of fifteen hundred people will no longer have eight or ten churches. There is an area here of administrative simplification that should be regarded as open to continuous experiment, but this probably should not be the main emphasis when we think of church union in future years.

In the discussions of the Faith and Order Commission of the World Council of Churches in the last few years, there has been a change in emphasis in what is assumed to be the goal of church unity. The profound difficulty of finding any way to overcome the differences that prevent full mutual recognition and intercommunion among churches with fundamentally different conceptions of the Church and the ministry has taken most of the attention of those who have engaged in discussions of unity. But all the time there has been the implicit assumption that the goal is one unified church administration within a nation.

The fact that the Anglican communion does have a considerable amount of decentralization, because of the independence of the various dioceses and because of the complete administrative freedom of the churches of that communion in the various nations, has sometimes caused it to be considered a model for a future church. But even this regional decentralization, with the development of a common church government responsible for most of the Protestants in a region, would be formidable.

Today there is the beginning of fresh thought about the goal of unity insofar as it affects administration and the location of power in a united church. Here warnings against bigness have their place. Here the human temptations that accompany a centralized structure of ecclesiastical power need great attention. Not enough of Dr. Blake's proposal has been spelled out with reference to problems of this sort, and we shall have to await further elaboration before we can make a more considered judgment.

J. C. B.

## THE NEW ORLEANS OUTBREAK

**V**IEWED from afar, the recent ugly outburst of racial animosity in New Orleans seems almost incredible. Whether on the part of the Louisiana Legislature hysterically enacting emergency "interposition" legislation, or on the part of the rag-tag female vigilantes vilifying the few who broke the segregation line, this vicious fury, displayed for all Africa and Asia to see, is shocking indeed. It serves to remind us, in case we have forgotten, how close bestiality and anarchy lurk under the surface of humanity and culture. Yet viewed from closer at hand, and from the standpoint of a Christian understanding of the mixture of good and evil in the human heart, the incident reveals more subtle moral facets that serve partly to explain—though not to condone—such raw and bestial behavior. There are poignant and pathetic elements mixed with the vice.

One newspaper picture shows a mother carrying a Holy Bible, reviling the young Methodist minister on the front lawn of his house. Another shows him emerging from church, Bible in hand, after delivering a sermon on brotherly love, to face the jeers of the hecklers who did not quite dare raise a disturbance in church, but waited until afterwards to cry "nigger lover." The Catholic priest who came to the help of the minister, according to another report, "held up a Bible against their distorted, jeering faces," as they insulted him.

That both sides carry their Bibles to the controversy is symbolic of a tragic element in this collision. No doubt the embattled mothers are convinced that they are doing the brave and noble thing, protecting their children and children's children against the fatal infection of racial mixing. The Legislature—whose sessions probably opened with prayer—resolved to commend the parents who withdrew their children from school "for their courageous stand against the forces of integration and those who seek to destroy all that we hold near and dear." The evil is done in the name of conscience. When the religious sanction of the Bible is used to confirm the moral conviction, the circle of militant self-righteousness is closed.

Yet there is one curious feature of the New Orleans incident that betrays the presence of the tortured conscience of the South, below the level of its own awareness. The mob action of the segregationists was directed in part against Negroes. But at the Frantz School, the real fury of the "banshees,"

as they have been called, was unleashed against the white persons who betrayed the cause. It is not white against Negro so much as "loyal" white against "disloyal" white.

Further, when the opposing white turns out to be a respected parish priest or a young minister, child in hand, when the Bible shows up on the other side of the battle-line, then the tight circle of self-assurance is somehow broken, and the conscience lashes out in a wild display of rage. In a sense, this incident reveals the white Southern conscience brought to bay by the judgment of God, fighting not against Negroes but against its own better part.

It is heartening to see the authentic Church emerge in this crisis as the saving remnant, in the quiet courage of Rev. Foreman and Father Drolet, and in the fortitude of the Gabrielles, who have held a 20th century Thermopylae pass. Their action has now inspired others to challenge the boycott. The battle is far from won. The well-organized hecklers have now retreated to the more usual strategies of telephone threats and intimidation. But, at this writing, the tide seems to have turned toward a recovery of sanity and a modicum of Christian justice.

W. B.

## NATIONAL GOALS AND PURPOSE

ON NOVEMBER 28 the National Goals Commission, composed of distinguished educators and businessmen, made its report to the President. The report supported a balanced budget, more aid to education and housing, more generous foreign aid and many other good causes.

Nevertheless, the press has received the report with a lack of enthusiasm. The *New York Post* and *The New York Times* expressed gratitude for the fact that a Presidential election could do more than a non-partisan commission to make the national sense of direction explicit. Commission members could not agree on a target for the increase of the gross national product or even on the advisability of abolishing the Connally Amendment's limitation of the jurisdiction of the International Court.

In a minority report, President Clark Kerr of the University of California insisted that the increase in the gross national product should be set at no less than four per cent and possibly five per cent. Repeal of the Connally Amendment was urged by a distinguished minority: Chairman Wriston, Vice Chairman Frank Pace, Mr. Canham of the *Christian Science Monitor*, former President Conant of Harvard, General Gruenther, President Kerr, Chairman Kilian of M.I.T. and Mr. Meany of the AFL-CIO.

The failure of the Commission as a whole to deal with the specific problem of the International Court reflects the tendency of all such commissions to settle for generalities when they cannot agree on specific programs. The Commission piously expressed interest in the advancement of "world law," and suggested, incongruously, that the United Nations must be supported even though, as presently constituted, it "provides a forum for Soviet propaganda and dissension and for the Soviet veto to block free world advances."

But we are confronted here with a deeper problem than the failure of a mixed commission to agree on specifics. That problem emerges when we compare the Commission's report with the series of essays by distinguished Americans published in *The New York Times* and *Life*, and subsequently embodied in a volume entitled *The National Purpose* (Holt, \$2.50).

Both the Commission and the essays fail to define the hazards of the cold war accurately. Both rely on the Declaration of Independence to state our prevailing national sense of direction. Both are only dimly aware of the fact that the democratic system of government that flowered in 18th and 19th century European culture presupposes a regard for the "dignity of the individual" that may be the peculiar and unique achievement of a culture informed by the Judeo-Christian religious and cultural tradition. Neither reveals awareness of the fact that our democracy validated itself only in the latter part of the 19th and the beginning of the 20th century. By a tortuous process it overcame the excessive individualism of the 18th century, and proved that it could make freedom compatible with national stability and justice for the collective interests of classes and races. (We are now, in fact, in a belated chapter of that process, as we try to give basic equality to our Negro citizens.)

There is a touch of American messianism in both the report and the essays, most succinctly expressed in Archibald MacLeish's contribution to *The National Purpose*: "There are those who declare that the emancipation of humanity, the freedom of man and mind is nothing but a dream. They are right. It is. It is the American dream."

This is a rather large order, and it is pretentious to regard ourselves as the peculiar instruments of providence to "liberate mankind." Not only will our foes regard these pretensions with cynicism, but our allies will realize, with an impatient bafflement, that decades of hazardous world hegemony have not cured us of giving grand and idealistic answers to complex practical issues.



What are our European allies to make of the great American idealist, President David Sarnoff of RCA? On the one hand, he calls for an accentuation of the cold war with no quarter given. On the other, he piously declares: "Whenever the United States tried to act without moral conviction or contrary to our basic beliefs, it found itself inhibited and ultimately had to rechart its course."

What will de Gaulle make of this sentimental idealism, as he stakes his political life and the future of his nation on the hazardous task of giving Algeria self-determination? Nor will the British be either inspired or illumined by our abstract idealism. They are busy in the tasks of political midwifery. They have seen Ghana and Nigeria come to birth and are now baffled by the political problems of their projected Federation of Rhodesia and Nyasaland. Their concerns will certainly not be illuminated by our discussion of national purpose and national goals.

What are our European allies, long impatient with our China policy, to make of the fact that the President's Commission only warns against the peril

of Red China, but has nothing to say about the revision of our policy, which has long been the prisoner of the myth that the Communists conquered China because we failed to give Chiang adequate support? There can be no genuine arms agreement until we are prepared to admit that the Government of the little island of Taiwan is not the rightful ruler, present or prospective, of the Chinese mainland.

Our allies have frequently heard about our devotion to the Declaration of Independence. But that speaks about rights, the "rights of life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness." Now we must deal not with rights but with possibilities, not with the abstract individual but with the task of relating individual freedom to communal security and stability.

In short, after decades of experience in what we call "world leadership," it is time that we grew up. As we have it from scripture: "When I was a child, I spoke like a child, I thought like a child, I reasoned like a child; when I became a man, I gave up childish ways. R. N.

## Dilemmas of Economic Growth

ROBERT LEKACHMAN

*To those who clamour, as many now do, 'Produce! Produce!' one simple question may be addressed: 'Produce what?' If the nation desires to re-equip its industries with machinery and its railways with wagons, had it not better refrain from holding exhibitions designed to encourage rich men to re-equip themselves with motor cars? What can be more childish than to urge the necessity that productive power should be increased, if part of the productive power which exists already is misapplied? Is not less production of futilities as important as, indeed, a condition of more production of things of moment?*

R. H. Tawney, *The Acquisitive Society*, 1921.

AMERICA IS the classic land of growth. It has been dominated by the vision of expansion in most measurable quantities—area, urban conglomerates, average incomes and ordinary comfort. It is all the more difficult, therefore, for such a people to face either the possibility that the dynamic of expansion has begun to slow or the certainty that growth itself is not enough, and that problems of allocation and social equity do not march to automatic solutions when rates of growth ascend to five or six per cent.

No doubt we should be wary of over-rapid generalization from recent experience. Nevertheless,

the facts of our growth performance during the recent past are not encouraging. For nearly a century our per-man output rose at a rate of something like 1.7 per cent every year. But in the last eight years this increase has amounted to only 0.8 per cent annually, a drop of over one-half.

The concomitant of this decline has been the steady upward drift of unemployment. During the years of economic expansion, 1951 to 1953, unemployment hovered around the two million mark, but in the rise that terminated in the spring of 1960, the average was nearer four million, and even so cheerful a prophet as *Fortune* anticipates over five million out of work this winter. We have become increasingly accustomed to idle capacity in industries that once led the world. Now, when

Mr. Lekachman teaches economics at Barnard College in New York City. His articles have appeared in *The New Republic*, *Commentary*, *The Commonwealth* and elsewhere.

the Ford Motor Company wishes to expand its world facilities, it centers its investment in England and West Germany rather than the United States. In steel, mechanical appliances, industrial equipment and pharmaceuticals, foreign competition has damaged American sales abroad and at home.

These representative facts only begin to suggest how badly our economy suffers when growth slackens. Nor is the prospect more cheering. The foreseeable industrial and demographic trends of the next decade will certainly intensify our troubles. The spurt in birth rates that began in the 1940s will produce one of its results in vastly enlarged additions to the labor force of the 1960s. At the same time, automation in the factory and the office promises—or threatens—to displace large numbers of routine mechanical employees. Without doubt these twin movements will substantially increase average rates of unemployment unless economic growth resumes at considerably increased rates.

Moral and political arguments reinforce the urgency of higher growth. Unemployment does not fall equally upon all members of our society. On the contrary, where discrimination is greatest unemployment is invariably highest. Thus in our current recession, Negro unemployment substantially exceeds ten per cent while general unemployment is less than half that figure. Trade unions protect their members by seniority provisions that typically afflict Negroes and Puerto Ricans most severely, since these groups are the last hired and the first fired.

Again, retarded growth intensifies the troubles of depressed areas in West Virginia, Pennsylvania, Maine and elsewhere, for even their best efforts at redevelopment inevitably become more difficult in recession than in prosperity. Finally, the incidence of unemployment is heaviest among new entrants to the labor market, young people who bring neither experience nor practical skills to their first jobs. Hence a decent sense of social equity demands that economic growth accelerate and unemployment decline in its wake.

The overriding priority of growth appears all the more irrefutable when it is noted that tax receipts rise in seasons of fair economic weather and fall when the prospect is obscured. For the nerve that Galbraith plucked is still twanging: we have as a people shamefully neglected public purposes in favor of private gratifications. What supports the public economy is taxes. If we want the schools, parks, roads, museums and public housing that our decaying cities desperately need; if we aim to play a generous as well as a self-interested part in

the economic development of the new African nations; if we wish to ensure the success of the great Indian experiment in democracy, then these great purposes demand of us that we devote more resources to public uses.

The central mechanism is the tax system. At the best of times taxes are painful, but they are more painful still when incomes sag and each dollar assumes greater importance than ever before. Surely we can finance our public programs more easily while the economy surges forward than when it lags. Apparently, then, our private comfort and our public decency converge to preach the lesson that economic growth must be resumed and that a new Administration must urgently turn its attention to the restoration of our flagging economic energies.

### A Tempting Snare

As far as it goes, this argument is compelling. Without doubt no industrial economy in this century can afford protracted unemployment of any considerable size. If there were no other reason, the psychological expectations of Western society have been so altered by the Keynesian revolution in economic thought that everyone is convinced that the cure of unemployment is in the hands of any vigorous government.

But this reiteration of the same economic imperative of high growth contains a tempting snare. While economic growth is indeed an essential of our communal health, it is much less than a complete solution to several of our major problems. Let us consider here only three of them: persistent structural unemployment, economic instability and the shift of resources from private to public hands.

Take first unemployment. Why will even a high rate of growth fall short of its elimination? Part of the answer is recorded in the sad tale of communities and whole regions whose industries have moved to more favorable economic climates or have lost out in the competition with newer products that better satisfy consumer tastes. Thus in New England, Maine has lost almost all of the textile mills that in the past supplemented lumbering and the tourist trade as major income sources. In West Virginia and Pennsylvania, improved technology and the continuing shift to oil and gas as heat sources have displaced thousands of coal miners. In a less obvious way the fantastic changes in agronomy of the last decades have caused rural underemployment, declining incomes and endemic depression.

Even though it may be granted that readjustment is easier when growth is high, it would be sensible and moral to ask how much mobility—a good word in the economist's lexicon—we should force upon our farmers and our displaced factory and mine workers. Even in America geographical mobility is painful to many, and occupational mobility frequently implies a loss of status that is hard to bear. It is far from net gain when impoverished rural workers move to better-paid employment in the cities. At the least we should do what we can to bring new industry to depressed communities rather than insist that the unemployed shift to the places where work is to be found. This I take to be one of the mandates with which Senator Kennedy has charged a distinguished committee headed by Senator Douglas.

Nor does prosperity solve the continuing problem of economic discrimination, which now inflicts higher unemployment and lower incomes upon our minorities even when times are good. If we are truly serious about promoting economic growth and diminishing unemployment, we face in the coming years a series of complex issues relating to community redevelopment, industrial retraining and intensified pressure toward equality upon both unions and employers.

### **To Spend or Not to Spend**

Prosperity is no better as an answer to that persistent disease of industrial societies, the business cycle. While it is accurate to say that economics has not yet offered a completely satisfactory explanation of why these repetitive expansions and contractions harass modern societies, it is fairly plain that certain of our attitudes and practices intensify economic instability. To paraphrase Keynes, the problem of poor societies is starvation, the problem of rich societies is instability. This is another way of noting that the opportunity of economic choice does not exist in a really poor society: whatever is produced is quickly consumed. General glut, as the classical economists used to term overproduction, is impossible.

But the same is not true of any society in which discretionary spending power is high as in the United States and the newly affluent countries of western Europe. The discretion to spend contains the discretion not to spend, and the discretion to change from one mode of expenditure to another—from automobiles to European travel, or from refrigerators to college tuition. It is unnecessary to repeat the Galbraithian critique of the triviality of

private consumption in order to make the relevant economic point that the smaller the percentage of our incomes that we dependably spend on the necessities of life the more precarious is the continuation of any period of prosperity.

### **To Promote Economic Stability**

This is all the more true when we observe the considerable ingenuity of the talented folk who staff our advertising agencies and devote their formidable energies to coaxing people to buy when they don't really very much want to. When the consumers rebel, as they did ultimately against the auto manufacturers, the system trembles.

An added element is consumer credit. The frantic overborrowing of a year like 1955 when the auto industry produced and sold nearly eight million passenger vehicles is inevitably followed by dreary years when borrowers repay their loans and postpone new purchases. Thus the poor judgment we display in dividing our expenditures between what really satisfies some basic taste and what merely titillates briefly intensifies the instability of our economic system.

This consideration brings us to the last of our problems. One of the attractions of Galbraith's recommendation of enlarged public spending and diminished private spending is the prospect that its adoption will diminish economic instability. Presumably consumers who must make do with smaller incomes will curtail their expenditures on the comparatively inessential, where demand fluctuates widely, and concentrate on the comparatively essential, where demand is much steadier. **Partly because** it presumably will be directed to pressing long-run needs, especially in our urban communities, we can anticipate that it will be a good deal more predictable than the private spending it replaces. Thus both private and public outlays should be steadier and cyclical swings much less pronounced.

It is by no means certain, despite Senator Kennedy's election, that the general public has really accepted the necessity of higher taxes to finance a superior order of public activity. If it has, and if we are really serious about Galbraith's line of analysis, we must recognize that the very errors of the past make it exceedingly difficult to achieve painless reform.

For one thing, too much of our economy is based upon the production of the inessential. Should we spend less on consumer durables and insist upon less wasteful model change policies, the immediate



sufferers could scarcely fail to be all those who make their livings from the automobile. Their number include not only the assembly line attendants of Michigan and elsewhere, but also workers in steel, rubber, fabrics, glass and paint, and at the other end of the productive process, automobile dealers, accessory merchants and service station operators.

In time, no doubt, those who are displaced will find alternative employment in the industries—principally construction—that the redeployment of resources will stimulate. Such consolation is exceedingly slight for those whose troubles are immediate. Hence any substantial shift of resources from private to public hands will pose even larger problems of retraining and mobility than those caused by structural unemployment. The problems are not only economic. We ask a lot of any group of humans when we coolly suggest that what they are now doing is no longer essential and suggest that they should move on with our united regrets to some other place and position.

Our economic future contains its dilemma what-

ever path we choose. If we continue to grow insufficiently, our penalties in unemployment, unhappiness and social discontent will be deservedly huge. If we grow more rapidly but divide the fruits of growth between private and public uses, much as we do now, then we shall preserve the existing instabilities of our economy, continue the grave imbalance between individual affluence and communal poverty, and suffer the misdirection of tastes and resources which this imbalance implies.

If, on the most cheerful hypothesis, the election of Senator Kennedy portends a genuine national reconsideration of our economy, we cannot lightly assume that this reconsideration does not bring in its train very substantial difficulties. Only partly are they the economist's familiar domain: redeployment of men and factories, industrial retraining and geographical mobility. Even more they are those of the social psychologist. For we are asking a new judgment of what counts in life from those who have lived by older judgments. Yet, it is on this last path that our economic health and our national greatness are to be found.

## Africa, Christianity and the West

ALAN PATON

*This article is excerpted from the last speech delivered by Alan Paton prior to leaving the United States last fall. Mr. Paton's passport was taken from him on December 5th when he returned to South Africa especially to attend a consultation on race relations called by the World Council of Churches. It is unfortunate that the South African Government has even further weakened its moral position in the eyes of the world. As for Mr. Paton, our sorrow and regret that he cannot return to us are mitigated by the assurance that his witness will continue undaunted.*

THE EDITORS

**W**E ARE LIVING at the end of an age—the end of the domination of the West—and Africans are experiencing the violence of being reborn. If we are to understand what is happening there, we must see the three striking characteristics of the modern African continent:

(1) The determination of every country and every people (and this Americans can well understand) to be free from any kind of external domination whatsoever. (2) Their determination to make their countries modern so that they can abolish

illiteracy, disease and poverty; so that they can train their engineers, doctors, administrators and teachers. And this is not a materialistic motive. Rather this is a spiritual motive—the determination that these new countries should walk as equals in the company of the countries of the earth. (3) The bitter resentment of the arrogant rule of the West.

The tragedy of this arrogance is that it so often leads to hostility to Christianity, hostility to missions and missionaries, hostility to Western ideas of democracy and education, hostility sometimes even to the United Nations, hostility even to a man like Dr. Ralph Bunche (and the fact that he is not a white man does not save him from this particular kind of criticism). These are things that have their seeds in this arrogance of the past. And this factor must never be underestimated.

I would say that there has definitely been a decline in the self-respect and self-assurance of the people of the West. And I would say that this was the result of several very shaking experiences. When I look back on my own lifetime, I think of how it started in 1914 and was repeated in 1939. I think of the terrible shame that one of the great nations of the West should have murdered six million Jews;

Mr. Paton joined the ranks of Winston Churchill, Paul-Henri Spaak, Walter Lippmann, Dwight D. Eisenhower and other world figures in October when he came here to receive the Annual Freedom Award. In March, Scribner's will publish *Tales From A Troubled Land*, a collection of hitherto unpublished short stories.

I think of the dropping of two atomic bombs, of the treatment of the Negro here in the United States, and of the treatment of African people in Africa.

I think also of an experience of my own: the realization that my own people, the white people of South Africa, would not yield one jot or tittle of their power or privilege until they were compelled to do so. And I must say that it is a sobering experience to realize that while individual man may turn and mend his ways, collective man finds it much more difficult.

### **The West's Opportunities**

However, I didn't come here tonight to speak to you about the sins of the West. I come rather to speak to you about the great opportunities to restore our self-respect and self-assurance and, at the same time, to render a service of a most magnificent kind.

In the past we have always gone to other countries and said: "We know what you need and we're going to give it to you." Now we have to learn a new lesson. We must say to them: "What kind of country is it that you want to build? What kind of use do you want to make of this new freedom that you have found?" And if we understand and sympathize with these things, then we must ask them further: "What can we do to help you to realize this modernity that you are so anxious to acquire? How can we help you to develop the resources of your country? How can we help you with the education of your children?"

Most Americans are astonished to learn how few universities there are in Africa. I just want you to realize that the university education in Africa is still a rare thing and that it might even be necessary for a country such as America to find some special, fresh kind of education that would enable people to learn in two years what they might at their leisure acquire in four.

I think there is one other great contribution that the people of the United States can make to the development of these new countries of Africa, and that is to restore the great damage that has been done to her own influence and authority by the fact that the deliberate speed enjoined upon her has been so much more deliberate than speedy. Undoubtedly one of the greatest things that you could do for us in South Africa would be to hasten the pace of the attempt to get rid of any kind of racial discrimination in your own society.

I have just been down to the state of Georgia, and I must say it is very fantastic to go into the

Capitol and to see the state coat of arms and its wonderful motto: "Wisdom, justice and moderation." But don't think I'm pointing a finger at you because we also have a great motto in South Africa. Our motto, in the most divided country in the world, is: "Unity is strength."

I think it says a lot about ourselves and about human beings that we pick out these great slogans and mottoes. Although we are not just, we must pay this great homage to justice; although we are not free, we must pay this great homage to freedom. Quite a remarkable thing. But I think the thing that cannot be forgiven—any man can be forgiven for not being able to obtain the great ideals that he strives after—is to proclaim these great ideals and then to proceed in a contrary direction as so many of us do.

One of the reasons why it is almost impossible to speak about South Africa separately is that, while the rest of the continent of Africa is moving so firmly in the direction of liberation and independence, we in South Africa are moving in the opposite direction. There was one great mistake the British made when they gave a constitution to this new Union of South Africa, and that was that they didn't give us a written constitution and a bill of rights. Had they given them to us, we would not be in the deep distress that we are in today—the Nationalists would have been prevented from proceeding at the fast pace at which they have proceeded.

We like to give nice names to these laws of ours. When we say to the University of Capetown or to the University of Johannesburg, "You may not admit non-white students," we call that the University Extension Act. And when they take away a man's job because of his color, they call that the Industrial Conciliation Act. I am always so filled with anger when I think of these laws and when I think of the noble goals they are supposed to attain and of the cruel things they do to men and women that I cannot speak other than what I do now.

### **Increasing Isolation**

But one thing is quite certain, that our isolation from the rest of the world increases. I am sure there are many Afrikaaners, including churchmen, who are very anxious and disturbed by the direction that their Government has taken. I just wish that they would more often exercise the prophetic role of judgment that a Christian is sometimes called upon to exercise.

It is a very interesting thing that the Afrikaaner



calls himself by a name which means a "man of Africa." It is tragic to record that he is the African who is afraid of Africa. And yet, they are a religious people, but I must say that we white people of South Africa have rewritten the great "second commandment" of Christianity, and it now reads: "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself . . . so long as he does not live next door."

What is the future to be? I would like to say, first, that there is one thing that is certainly never to be the solution of our difficulties in South Africa, and that will be the policies of *apartheid*. They are completely unacceptable to the people of Africa—for that reason and that reason alone, their life is almost done.

Naturally I would like to have seen the people of South Africa come to their senses and I would like to have seen them open the door of opportunity to African people, not only in work and in education but also in the highest posts that could be available to them in government and in all of society. But I have come to the conclusion that whatever changes come will not come about that way. I don't suppose this is a disillusionment to American people because they must realize that if it had been left to the white people of the South to abolish practices of segregation, then who knows when they would have been abolished. You are very lucky in this country to have an additional force that you can exert—the power of the law. We cannot do that. The power of the law is against us.

Even if we do not experience a change of heart, there is still hope that we might experience a change of attitude. But this will only come about if the external pressures upon us become unendurable.

I do not exclude the possibility that one day our Government may be forced to say: "For God's sake come and help us." However, even if that were not to happen, if conflict and violence ensued and if the nations of Africa became more and more oppressive towards us, then it might still be necessary for the United Nations to intervene, to give us some kind of interregnum, the kind of government that would call out the best men from every race group and say to them: "Sit down and form a government; learn to work together. We'll give you a breathing space—ten years, fifteen years—to see whether you can come to your senses."

If that is not to be true, there is a third possibility: that we would go into an age of revolution, chaos and hatred of a kind that one hardly likes to contemplate. But that will only be if the United Nations has ceased to be the instrument of world

authority. Thus you will see why people like myself in South Africa also look to the United Nations for some kind of help and support.

### **A Land of Fear . . . and Courage**

I call South Africa a land of fear. Well, in some ways that is true. In some ways it is a land of great courage also. It wasn't long ago that many of my friends were arrested and put into prison, and were released without the preferring of any charge whatsoever against them. One of my greatest friends had taught his children sanctity of the law, to respect the police as the arm of the law. At three o'clock one morning the police knocked on the door of his little daughter's room to say that they wanted her father; an hour later she saw her father taken away. One can just imagine the bewilderment and confusion.

When these people were released, they immediately took up the very same activities for which they had been sent to prison. While one has friends like that, there is still every reason to have hope. People ask me why I don't leave my country. And I always reply that if I saw no hope I would leave it.

And I might say that these people who went to prison didn't lose their sense of humor either, for some of them were very annoyed to think that they had gone to prison while I was still living at large outside. Now they made a plan to get me in. The plan was to take a piece of paper, tie it on a stone and to be seen throwing this stone over the walls of the prison to the street outside. And on this piece of paper was to be written: "Paton, for God's sake, hide those revolvers."

Although we are such a separated people, there are many white people who have the strongest possible bonds with African people; many African people have the strongest possible bonds with Indian people and Coloured people. There are still people who cross these lines.

And there is another thing which sustains us, the concern of our friends, the concern of the American Committee on Africa and its Africa Defense and Aid Fund, which I would like to commend to your attention. If it had not been for the help we had received from the Defense and Aid Fund, I do not know what we would have done. Four years ago, 156 people were arrested on charges of treason, and the case is still being tried. At first 60 were allowed to go, and then another 60, and finally 30 have been on trial for a period over four years. And so far this trial has cost us something like \$300,000. I have no doubt that one of the intentions of the Govern-

ment is to keep people tied up in trials of this kind. But I tell you that we couldn't have given them the defense that we did if it had not been for the generosity of our friends here and in other countries. I would like to give my thanks to all those who helped the Defense Fund of the American Committee.

### The Danger to Christianity

I would like to say a word about the witness or lack of witness of the churches in South Africa. And you know that the Church has a prophetic role which it must exercise if it is to be true to itself. There are times when the most creative thing to do is to protest. We have been very fortunate in having men like the Bishop of Johannesburg, who was deported from our country some weeks ago. The reason he was deported was because his principles did not allow him to accept the principles of *apartheid*. We also have in the Archbishop of Cape-town, in the bishops of the Roman Catholic Church, and the leaders of other English-speaking churches a great deal to be thankful for.

There is a great struggle in the mind of the Christian person in South Africa because he derives benefits from the practices of *apartheid*, and yet, in his heart, he knows that it can't be true. So he erects these great hypocritical beliefs to assure himself that what he is doing is good and right. It is true that we no longer defend our practices on scriptural grounds (we gave that up 10 years ago); now we defend them on other grounds of Christian ethics.

You do not understand *apartheid* if you do not understand that there are at least two factors operating in it. One is fear for yourself, fear of being outnumbered, determination to keep your position of supremacy; the other is those good impulses struggling within you, and you want to do this in the best way possible. And so these two impulses—one evil and one good—must somehow be reconciled, and you all know that goodness and evil can never be reconciled.

A person like myself is often regarded as an extremist in South Africa. If it be extreme to choose justice and not injustice and not to seek some middle road between them, then I am happy to be called an extremist. If it is extreme to choose good and not evil, and not to seek some compromise between them, then again I am happy to be called an extremist.

Christians often imagine that the danger to Christianity and true religion is communism or something of that nature. The greatest danger to Chris-

tianity in Africa is pseudo-Christianity. And the marks of pseudo-Christianity are easy to recognize: it always prefers stability to change; it always prefers order to freedom; it always prefers the law to justice; and it always prefers what it considers realism to love. We as Christians should be rejoicing in the liberation of the people of South Africa; yet so many of us are afraid to do so.

As I say, pseudo-Christianity always exalts realism above love. It says, "You know, Paton, you are really talking a lot of bloody nonsense because human beings don't act in that way. You don't understand human nature. You are trying to achieve the impossible. It is all very well to say no compromise between justice and injustice, but it is politics to try to find some kind of compromise."

Seeing that this meeting is being held in a church, I would like to conclude with a few thoughts on the law of love. I think that ultimately if one wants to be a good man, one must live by the law of love no matter what the cost of it may be. If it means that suffering is the price that must be paid for it, then you must suffer. One simply lives by the law of love whatever the consequences may be. And if that is not the meaning of faith, then I don't know what is.

One must never identify suffering with love, nor must one seek suffering. One who seeks suffering is not loving, he is merely sick. But a person who shrinks from suffering when that is the price that must be paid is sick too. But, of course, there is so much more than suffering in love, for it is in loving that we are nearest to God; in loving we are most nearly like him.

I cannot think of any more important thing that you Americans can do than that you discharge this love and its responsibilities for your fellow men in Africa, who only now are beginning to look to a future where they will enjoy many of the bounties and blessings that you have enjoyed for so long.

### CORRESPONDENCE

#### The Puerto Rican Bishops Again

TO THE EDITORS: Sometimes I wonder whether you people are deliberately following a professionally pro-Catholic policy. Here is an example of the sort of thing that is repeatedly done in your columns.

Roger L. Shinn ("What the Campaign Did to Religion," Nov. 14) deals with the voting orders given by Puerto Rican bishops there—surely one of the crassest demonstrations of clericalism ever witnessed on American soil. After describing the orders of the Puerto Rican bishops, Mr. Shinn then states that

Cardinal Spellman has said that voters who disregarded such orders would not commit a sin. Thus the impression was created in the minds of readers who trusted your journal that the Roman Catholic Church refused to back this clerical interference in Puerto Rican affairs.

Your writer did not see fit to tell his readers that the Vatican itself had promptly (on October 26) supported the Puerto Rican bishops in their right to give voting orders.

In an article addressed to the Puerto Rican situation and quoted in many papers, *L'Osservatore Romano* reiterated that "the Church has the right and duty to explain to the faithful, the moral obligations which they must respect as voters." The church cannot "stand aside" in any country, the article said, unless it were a situation in which all parties fully respected the rights of the Catholic Church. The *Official Catholic Directory* for 1960, at page 787, states that the Puerto Rican dioceses are "immediately subject to the Holy See by apostolic brief *actum praeclare* February 20, 1903." Nor did Mr. Shinn state that the Puerto Rican bishops (Cardinal Spellman really has nothing to do with it) had explicitly stated that refusal to obey orders would constitute a sin that would have to be confessed like any other sin.

The facts are that priests are now barring from Communion those who have refused to confess and do penance because they cast a "sinful" vote for Muñoz Marín.

It is all very well to be charitable, but as one who has subscribed to your journal for a long time I certainly expect you to handle facts honestly.

C. STANLEY LOWELL  
Associate Director, POAU  
Washington, D. C.

Mr. Lowell quite misses the point of the editorial that arouses his call for honesty. We said that the recent political campaign had strengthened liberal voices within Roman Catholicism. That is why it was worth noting that Cardinal Spellman, among many American Catholics, rejected the stand of the Puerto Rican bishops. Also the Jesuit weekly, *America*, used the word "profanation" in criticizing the "prohibition." The *Commonweal*, a lay journal, took a similar view. President-elect Kennedy publicly reaffirmed his freedom and, according to *Newsweek*, sent a "blistering" letter to one of the offending bishops.

We need hardly add that we disapprove the Puerto Rican edict—as well as Protestant sermons telling congregations whom to vote against.

Mr. Lowell errs, as have many others, when he identifies the Vatican with *L'Osservatore Romano*, the "unofficial politico-religious daily newspaper of the Holy See" (*Catholic Almanac*). Its authority or lack of authority was explained in this journal by Daniel J. Callahan (Oct. 3, p. 138). Far more important than its editorial is the fact that the Bishop of San Juan has retreated, saying there will be no denial of sacraments or other punishment for those who disregarded the pastoral letter.

Thus we stand by our thesis. We hope that liberal forces continue to gain—in Catholicism, in Protestantism, and in POAU. R. L. S.

### More on "Success" and "Failure"

TO THE EDITORS: My first reaction to my good friend George Younger's article, "'Success' and 'Failure' in Inner-City Churches" (Nov. 28), was to sit down and write a witty and devastating reply. I shall not, because he is quite right in calling for an end to this argument, which perhaps has served its purpose. With great Christian forbearance I shall resist completing the quotations of which he reported only the half that helped make his point; if I can serve as straw man, nothing suffers but my pride.

I was asked to deliver a "provocative" speech a couple of years ago, and succeeded far beyond my expectations. I considered what might best provoke some clergy to break through stereotyped thinking about the inner-city church, and it occurred to me that the best needle might be to challenge them with the proposition that the inner-city church can approximate the institutional "success" we are accustomed to expect of churches in the suburbs—which, incidentally, it very frequently can, with sufficient imagination and flexibility. I carefully labelled this proposition non-theological and even non-Christian; I described it as "a sociologist's idea of a successful voluntary institution," and I used words like "entrepreneur" to get across the idea.

I was surprised—rather happily surprised, because I enjoy such discussions—to find the statement an offense to a number of my contemporaries. I still do not quite understand why it is in such poor taste to have "successful" institutions in the inner-city when we accept them with equanimity elsewhere, but I defer completely to George Younger in his description of our theological situation; I have not only been much informed by his writing, but have borrowed heavily from his articles more than once when I have been called on to interpret the inner-city in its theological dimensions.

I do want, however, to state the real nature of my concern, and I can state it best perhaps by quoting the concluding paragraphs of the speech that was so "provocative":

"Now I don't know whether I have provoked you; I would guess that for some of you who are most sensitive to the spiritual demands of our faith, to the silent and devastating judgment of our Lord upon the things we do in his name, the emphasis I have placed on success and numbers is, to put it kindly, limited, and, to put it more severely, scarcely in the spirit of the Master. I plead guilty and confess that when we have done all we can to make a church successful as the world counts success, we still wait upon the grace of God to give this church his blessing, to redeem his people and make them an instrument of his redemptive work. It is possibly because I am a sociologist as well as a missionary that I am preoccupied with numbers; I am impelled always to look beyond the inner-city churches to



the vast multitudes outside these churches, and ask: 'What about these others?' I have seen study after study which shows the heavy concentration of church members in the more stable, more prosperous sections of our cities, and only a sparse sprinkling of members in the congested neighborhoods of the inner-city, and the sheer size of the need, the volume of the unchurched, is something that gives rise to a sense of desperation. I keep looking for ideas and men who can reach people in the hundreds rather than in the tens, even though I know God saves us one by one. It is one of the big dilemmas and one of the major tensions of this kind of ministry.

"And I keep encountering another kind of paradox: the message which is soporific and even sinful in the suburbs may be just the message to preach in the inner-city. Where people are smug and complacent and self-satisfied, sermons on love and success are spiritual soothing syrup; the preacher must convict his people of sin and failure which they have not even recognized. But what is soothing syrup in the suburbs may often be the meat of the Gospel in the inner-city where sin and failure and frustration are the stark realities of life; here people must learn of God's love and compassion and must be convinced that with God's help some measure of success is possible—and to some degree this must mean worldly success in terms of education and a job and a decent home. . . . in stable communities the so-called simple gospel may be simply an evasion of the moral complexities of our age; [however] among people not trained to think in abstractions or experienced in the power structures of urban life, a simple gospel is often just the rock they need, and the preacher who presents moral and theological subtleties may be indulging himself rather than speaking to need.

"And on the institutional level, where too much success in numbers in a suburban situation ought to cause a church to think hard about whether it is genuinely a church and not a popular social club, the inner-city desperately needs churches that are visible symbols of success, churches that say: 'The gospel has relevance here, it meets your neighbor's needs and can meet yours; here is the place where men and women of goodwill come together in this community, and there are many of them; here is understanding and compassion; and this is an important group; it is strong enough to make a real impact on this community, on this big impersonal

city that rejects you, that puts up cold hard barriers everywhere else you try to go.'"

Having confessed the sin of provocation, let me mention briefly my more serious sin: I am told that some mission executives have quoted this speech as justification for judging certain mission programs "failures" and questioning their continued support. If this is so, it further explains the uneasiness of some who have heard this word "success" bandied around. This interpretation is, again, a distortion of what was said, for the speech led up to as ringing a declaration as I could make that "more funds are mandatory" for inner-city work; that institutional strength is dependent upon the readiness of the denomination and its mission agencies to stand behind the inner-city church with the necessary resources. Missionary support should not be a reward for institutional "success"; indeed, the reverse is a more nearly adequate statement of policy. It is certainly an irresponsible kind of judgment if a mission board starves a missionary's program and then criticizes it for being too thin.

And once more, I freely agree that when institutional "success" has been achieved, while we may be more of a force to reckon with in the social order, we may be no whit nearer embodying the will of God in our own lives or the life of the community.

(The Rev.) DAVID W. BARRY  
Executive Director,  
New York City Mission Society  
New York, N. Y.

## CHRISTIANITY and CRISIS

*A Christian Journal of Opinion*

557 WEST 121 ST. • NEW YORK 27 • N. Y.

### EDITORIAL BOARD

REINHOLD NIEBUHR AND JOHN C. BENNETT, *Chairmen*

WAYNE H. COWAN, *Managing Editor*

ROBERT G. BATSON, *Assistant Editor*

M. SEARLE BATES WALDO BEACH AMOS WILDER

ROBERT MCAFEE BROWN F. ERNEST JOHNSON

ROGER L. SHINN HENRY P. VAN DUSEN

RICHARD T. BAKER J. OSCAR LEF

TOM F. DRIVER ROBERT W. LYNN

KENNETH W. THOMPSON WILLIAM LEE MILLER

### CONTRIBUTING EDITORS

HENRY SMITH LEIPER JOHN A. MACNAY

FRANCIS P. MILLER M. M. THOMAS

WILLIAM F. MAY J. B. DUROSSELLE

PAUL H. NITZE SIDNEY LANIER

HERBERT BUTTERFIELD

### CONTENTS

DILEMMAS OF ECONOMIC GROWTH

ROBERT LEKACHMAN

AFRICA, CHRISTIANITY AND THE WEST

ALAN PATON

DETROIT PUBLIC LIBRARY  
PHIL-RELIG & EDUC PER  
5201 WOODWARD AVE  
DETROIT 2 MICH  
9095 9-61R A